

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*BC8*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/556,517 04/21/00 SHIMA

T Q58755

WM31/0507  
SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS PLLC  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N W  
WASHINGTON DC 20037-3020

EXAMINER

WALLERSON, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED:

*4*  
05/07/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/556,517

Applicant(s)

Shima

Examiner

Mark Wallerson

Art Unit

2622



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-23 and 25-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-23 and 25-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 2 20) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2622

**Part III DETAILED ACTION**

**Notice to Applicant(s)**

1. This application has been examined. Claims 16-23 and 25-27 are pending.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement dated 4/21/2000 have been considered by the Examiner and is attached to this Office Action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

4. Claims 16, 20, and 25, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hsieh (U. S. 5,838,461).

With respect to claims 16, 20, and 25, Hsieh discloses a local router (8) comprising network communication means (9) which can connect to a communications network (column 2, line 13) and has a plurality of network addresses (column 2, lines 13-15) representing a plurality of locations (multiple PC's) on the network (column 2, lines 12-15) and which responds to a

Art Unit: 2622

communications message addressed to any one of the plural addresses (column 2, lines 26-30), and data transfer means (9) which can transfer the data addressed to any of the addresses to a plurality of destinations (which reads on entering all destination ID's) and selects destinations of the data according to the network address of the message (column 2, lines 27-30).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh in view of Allard et. al. (hereinafter referred to as Allard) (U. S. 5,729,689).

With respect to claim 17, Hsieh differs from claim 17 in that he does not clearly disclose that the local router can connect itself to network-incompatible devices. Allard discloses a communications network system wherein network-incompatible devices (addresses) are connected to a router (column 19, lines 10-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hsieh wherein the local router can connect itself to network-incompatible devices. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hsieh by the teaching of Allard in order to improve the communications process.

Art Unit: 2622

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh in view of Benash et. al. (hereinafter referred to as Benash) (U. S. 6,097,719).

With respect to claim 19, although Hsieh discloses that the network communications means has plural identifiers (column 2, lines 11-30), he does not clearly disclose using a TCP/IP protocol and packetizing the message. Benash discloses a network system which uses TCP/IP protocol to transmit messages (column 1, lines 14-28) and packetizes the messages (column 1, lines 41-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hsieh to use a TCP/IP protocol and packetize the message. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hsieh by the teaching of Benash in order to improve the transmission process.

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2622

10. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh in view of Allard as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Shaw et. al. (hereinafter referred to as Shaw) (U. S. 5,845,058).

With respect to claim 18, Hsieh as modified differs from claim 18 in that he does not clearly disclose that the devices are printers. Shaw discloses a communication system wherein a router is connected to plural printers (column 7, lines 1-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hsieh as modified wherein the devices are printers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hsieh as modified by the teaching of Shaw in order to be able to print out the received messages.

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 21, 22, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh in view of Allard and Shaw.

With respect to claims 21, 22, and 26, Hsieh discloses a local router (8) comprising network communication means (9) which can connect to a communications network (column 2, line 13) and has a plurality of network addresses (column 2, lines 13-15) representing a plurality

Art Unit: 2622

of locations (multiple PC's) on the network (column 2, lines 12-15) and which responds to a communications message addressed to any one of the plural addresses (column 2, lines 26-30), and data transfer means (9) which can transfer the data addressed to any of the addresses to a plurality of destinations (which reads on entering all destination ID's) and selects destinations of the data according to the network address of the message (column 2, lines 27-30).

Hsieh differs from claims 21 and 26 in that he does not clearly disclose that the local router can connect itself to network-incompatible devices. Allard discloses a communications network system wherein network-incompatible devices (addresses) are connected to a router (column 19, lines 10-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hsieh wherein the local router can connect itself to network-incompatible devices. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hsieh by the teaching of Allard in order to improve the communications process.

Further with respect to claims 21, 22, and 26, Hsieh as modified differs from claims 21, 22, and 26 in that he does not clearly disclose that the devices are printers. Shaw discloses a communication system wherein a router is connected to plural printers (column 7, lines 1-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hsieh as modified wherein the devices are printers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hsieh as modified by the teaching of Shaw in order to be able to print out the received messages.

Art Unit: 2622

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. Claims 23 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh in view of Shaw.

With regard to claims 23 and 27, Hsieh discloses relaying means (8) which can connect to other devices (7) and has the network addresses assigned to a device group (column 2, lines 11-30), and relays communication between the host and the devices in response to communication sent from the host (column 2, lines 11-30). Hsieh differs from claims 23 and 27 in that he does not clearly disclose that the devices are printers. Shaw discloses a communication system wherein a router is connected to plural printers (column 7, lines 1-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hsieh wherein the devices are printers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Hsieh by the teaching of Shaw in order to be able to print out the received messages.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Wallerson whose telephone number is (703) 305-8581.



Art Unit: 2622

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051 (for formal communications intended for entry)

(703) 305-9731 (for informal or draft communications, such as proposed amendments to be discussed at an interview; please label such communications "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

or hand-carried to:

Crystal Park Two

2121 Crystal Drive

Arlington, VA.

Sixth Floor (Receptionist)



MARK WALLERSON  
PATENT EXAMINER

MARK WALLERSON